IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA FLORENCE DIVISION

Chairut Siriwat,) C.A. No.: 4:08-00432-RBH
Plaintiff,) C.A. No.: 4:08-00432-RBH
VS.) O R D E R
South Carolina Department of Corrections;)
Kathy Hudson; Marsha Sellers; Thomas)
Byrne; Capt. Grimes; Capt. McKendly)
Newton; Capt. Joseph Deloach; Sgt. Teresa)
Ramsey; I/M Jesus Gonzales; Assoc.)
Warden John Pate; and Warden George T.)
Hagan,)
)
Defendants.)
)

This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

4:08-cv-00432-RBH Date Filed 02/27/09 Entry Number 38 Page 2 of 2

No objections were filed to the Report and Recommendation. The Report and

Recommendation [doc. entry #34] was mailed to the plaintiff on February 6, 2009 [doc. entry

#35]. The mail was returned to the court on February 17, 2009 [doc. entry #36] marked "Refused,

(RTS), Return to Sender, I/M released." In the absence of objections to the Report and

Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for

adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

After a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case,

the court adopts Magistrate Judge Rogers' Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein.

It is therefore

ORDERED that the motion filed by defendants [docket entry #21] for summary judgment

is **GRANTED**, and this action is dismissed with prejudice on the merits and also pursuant to Rule

41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any other outstanding motions are deemed MOOT.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ R. Bryan Harwell

R. Bryan Harwell

United States District Judge

Florence, South Carolina

February 27,2009

2